



The Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility  
Theory Group Preprint Series

Additional copies are available from the authors.

The Southeastern Universities Research Association (SURA) operates the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility for the United States Department of Energy under contract DE-AC05-84ER40150

## Heavy Quark Symmetries And The Decays $B \rightarrow$ Baryon Antibaryon \*

Thomas Mannel<sup>1,2†</sup> Winston Roberts<sup>1,3†</sup> Zbigniew Ryzak<sup>1‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lyman Laboratory of Physics  
Harvard University  
Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

<sup>2</sup> Deutsches Elektronen Synchrotron – DESY  
Hamburg, Fed. Rep. of Germany

<sup>3</sup> Department of Physics  
Old Dominion University  
Norfolk, VA 23529, USA  
and

Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility  
12000 Jefferson Avenue  
Newport News, VA 23606, USA

PACS: 12.15.Ji, 12.38.Lg, 14.40.Jz

### Abstract

We enumerate the form factors necessary to describe the two-body baryonic decays of  $B$  mesons. We use the symmetries of the heavy quark effective theory to arrive at some relations among these form factors, when at least one of the daughter baryons is heavy.

### DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States government. Neither the United States nor the United States Department of Energy, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, mark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or any agency thereof.

\*Work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant # 8714654.

<sup>†</sup>Supported by a Grant from Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

<sup>‡</sup>Supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and by the Department of Energy under Grant # DE-AC05-84ER40150.

<sup>§</sup>Supported by the Department of Energy under Grant # DE-AC02-76ER03064.

# 1 Introduction

The  $B$  meson offers a unique laboratory for the study of the interplay between weak and strong interaction dynamics, since it is the only meson that is sufficiently heavy to decay weakly into pairs of baryons. Indeed, present measurements indicate that the branching fraction for decays of this meson into  $p + \text{anything}$  is  $\approx 8\%$ , and into  $\Lambda + \text{anything}$  is  $\approx 4\%$  [1].

While it may be desirable to attempt to understand these inclusive modes directly, it is instructive to begin with a study of the exclusive two-body modes, since these are (hopefully) the least complicated modes to describe. In addition, many of the multi-particle modes may be understood as cascade processes which began as two-body modes, in which one or both daughter hadrons were themselves unstable.

To this end, we attempt to understand the general Lorentz structure of the amplitudes that describe these decays, namely  $B \rightarrow \text{baryon antibaryon}$ . In other words, we count the form factors necessary for these decays, with the only restriction being that both baryons are ground state ( $J^P = 1/2^+, 3/2^+$ ) baryons. We then use the additional symmetries of the heavy quark effective theory (HQET) [2] to find relationships among different form factors, when at least one of the daughter baryons is heavy. It turns out that HQET does not provide much help in limiting the number of form factors, and that explicit model calculations of the form factors would be needed.

In much of what follows, we are primarily interested in decays of the  $B$  meson in which at least one of the daughter baryons is heavy. We must therefore briefly elucidate the structure of the baryons we discuss. For the light baryons (i.e., baryons consisting solely of  $u$ ,  $d$  and  $s$  quarks), the usual nomenclature and spin assignments suffice. Thus, baryons from the  $J^P = 1/2^+$  ground state octet will be described by Dirac spinors, while those from the  $J^P = 3/2^+$  decuplet are described by a Rarita-Schwinger field.

For the heavy baryons, the spin symmetry of HQET allows us to relate some of the  $J^P = 1/2^+$  baryons to the  $J^P = 3/2^+$  baryons. It is therefore more useful to refer to these baryons as being ‘ $\Lambda$ -type’ baryons and ‘ $\Sigma$ -type’ baryons. In the  $\Lambda$ -type baryons, the light quarks and gluons have their spins coupled to give a total spin of zero, so that the total spin of the baryon is simply that of the heavy quark. The  $\Lambda$ -type baryons of interest here are the  $\Lambda_c$  ( $[(ud)_{0c}]_{1/2}$ ) and the  $\Xi_c$  ( $[(ds)_{0c}]_{1/2}$ ,  $[(us)_{0c}]_{1/2}$ ). These baryons may be represented by a Dirac spinor.

The  $\Sigma$ -type baryons are those in which the light quarks have a total spin of 1, so that the total spin of the baryon is  $1/2$  or  $3/2$ . These baryons include the  $\Sigma_c$  ( $[(ud)_{1c}]_{1/2}$ ), the  $\Sigma_c^*$  ( $[(ud)_{1c}]_{3/2}$ ), the  $\Xi_c$  ( $[(us)_{1c}]_{1/2}$ ) and the  $\Xi_c^*$  ( $[(us)_{1c}]_{3/2}$ ). To leading order in HQET, the  $\Sigma_c$  and  $\Sigma_c^*$  (or the  $\Xi_c$  and the  $\Xi_c^*$ ) are degenerate

members of the same multiplet. Generically, these baryons may be represented by the spinors  $\Sigma_c^{(*)}(v) \rightarrow B_\mu^{(m)}(v)$ . More specifically [3],

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_c(v), \Xi_c'(v) &\rightarrow B_\mu^{(1)}(v) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(v_\mu + \gamma_\mu)\gamma_5 u(v), \\ \Sigma_c^*(v), \Xi_c^*(v) &\rightarrow B_\mu^{(2)}(v) = u_\mu(v),\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where  $u_\mu(v)$  is the usual Rarita-Schwinger field. These objects satisfy the auxiliary conditions

$$\begin{aligned}v^\mu B_\mu^{(m)}(v) &= 0, \\ \not{p} B_\mu^{(m)}(v) &= B_\mu^{(m)}(v), \\ \gamma^\mu B_\mu^{(2)}(v) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

In addition, we note that the  $B$  meson may be represented by the matrix  $B \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{m_B}}{2}\gamma_5(\not{p} - 1)$ .

## 2 General Form Factors

There are basically three types of decay that are of interest to us. For the moment, we may classify these as decays in which: (a) both daughter baryons have  $J^P = 1/2^+$ ; (b) one daughter baryon has  $J^P = 3/2^+$  and the other has  $J^P = 1/2^+$ ; (c) both daughter baryons have  $J^P = 3/2^+$ . Later on, we will look at cases in which at least one of the daughter baryons is heavy, so that we may find relations among the form factors of the group (a), (b) and (c) decays.

For the group (a) decays ( $B \rightarrow \Lambda_c \bar{p}$ , for example), 2 form factors are needed. This can be seen by noting that the most general amplitude involving 2 Dirac spinors requires at most 2 form factors,

$$M = \bar{u}(v')(A + B\gamma_5)v(p).\tag{2}$$

For the group (b) decays, ( $B(v) \rightarrow \Lambda_c(v')\bar{\Delta}(p)$ , for example), 2 form factors are needed, since we can write

$$M = \bar{u}(v')M^\mu v_\mu(p),\tag{3}$$

where  $M^\mu = C v^\mu + D v^\mu \gamma_5$ , and  $v_\mu(p)$  is the Rarita-Schwinger field describing the  $\bar{\Delta}$ . Treating the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^* \bar{\Lambda}$  in a similar manner, we can write

$$M = \bar{u}_\mu(v')M^\mu v(p),\tag{4}$$

with  $M^\mu = C v^\mu + D v^\mu \gamma_5$ .

For the group (c) decays (such as  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^* \bar{\Delta}$ ), Lorentz invariance allows us to write

$$M = \bar{u}_\mu(v') P^{\mu\nu} v_\nu(p), \quad (5)$$

with

$$P^{\mu\nu} = E_1 g^{\mu\nu} + E_2 v^\mu v^\nu + [E_3 g^{\mu\nu} + E_4 v^\mu v^\nu] \gamma_5. \quad (6)$$

Four form factors are therefore needed to describe these decays. Note that so far, we have used only the principles of Lorentz symmetry to enumerate the form factors, so that these results are quite general. We have not yet taken advantage of any possible simplifications allowed by HQET. We now turn to the special cases when at least one of the daughter baryons is heavy.

### 3 The Decays Into Heavy Baryons

We begin by discussing the decays into 2 heavy baryons. These decays take place via the  $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$  current (or the Cabibbo suppressed  $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}d$  current). The possible final baryons therefore include  $\Xi_c$ ,  $\Xi_c'$ ,  $\Xi_c^*$ , while one may find  $\Lambda_c$ 's,  $\Sigma_c$ 's and  $\Sigma_c^*$ 's among the daughter antibaryons. The particular examples of decays we shall consider are  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c \bar{\Lambda}_c$ ,  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c \bar{\Sigma}_c^{(*)}$ ,  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^{(*)} \bar{\Lambda}_c$  and  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^{(*)} \bar{\Sigma}_c^{(*)}$ .

For the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c \bar{\Lambda}_c$ , we may write

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Xi_c(v_\Xi) \bar{\Lambda}_c(v_\Lambda) | \bar{s} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u \bar{c} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | B(v) \rangle \\ &= \bar{u}_\Xi(v_\Xi) \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \frac{\sqrt{m_B}}{2} \gamma_5 (\not{p} - 1) (\alpha + \not{p} \beta) \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) v_{\Lambda_c}(v_\Lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Here, we have used the symmetries of HQET to express the four-quark weak current responsible for the decay as a product of two, two-quark currents.

In terms of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} A &= 2\sqrt{m_B} [\alpha(r_1 - r_2) - \beta], \\ B &= -2\sqrt{m_B} [\alpha(r_1 + r_2) - \beta], \end{aligned}$$

where  $r_1 = m_{\Xi_c}/m_B$ ,  $r_2 = m_{\Lambda_c}/m_B$ . More generally,  $r_1$  is the ratio of the mass of the baryon to that of the  $B$  meson, while  $r_2$  is the ratio of the mass of the antibaryon to that of the  $B$  meson.

For the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^{(*)} \bar{\Lambda}_c$  (with similar arguments for  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c \bar{\Sigma}_c^{(*)}$ ), we may write

$$A(B \rightarrow \Xi_c^{(*)} \bar{\Lambda}_c) = \frac{\sqrt{m_B}}{2} \bar{B}_\lambda^{(m)}(v_\Xi) \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \gamma_5 (\not{p} - 1) M^\lambda \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u(v_\Lambda) \quad (8)$$

where  $B_\lambda^{(m)}$  has one of the forms shown in eqn. (1), depending on whether the antibaryon is the  $\Xi_c'$  or the  $\Xi_c^*$ . The Dirac matrix  $M_\lambda$  is a vector which must have the form

$$M^\lambda = v^\lambda \alpha + v^\lambda \not{p}_\Lambda \beta + \gamma^\lambda \gamma + \gamma^\lambda \not{p}_\Lambda \delta. \quad (9)$$

After some simplification, we write

$$\begin{aligned} A(B \rightarrow \Xi_c^{(*)} \bar{\Lambda}_c) &= 4\sqrt{m_B} \bar{B}_\nu^{(m)}(v_\Xi) (y_1 v_\Lambda^\nu + y_2 \gamma^\nu \\ &+ y_3 \gamma_5 v_\Lambda^\nu + y_4 \gamma^\nu \gamma_5) u_\Lambda(v_\Lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 &= -r_1 [\alpha(r_1 - r_2) + \gamma], \\ y_2 &= \beta + \delta [r_1 + r_2 (2v_\Lambda \cdot v_\Xi - 1)], \\ y_3 &= -r_1 [\alpha(r_1 + r_2) + \gamma], \\ y_4 &= -\{\beta + \delta [r_1 + r_2 (2v_\Lambda \cdot v_\Xi + 1)]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

When we specialize to the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^* \bar{\Lambda}_c$ , the  $\gamma^\nu$  terms of eqn. (10) vanish, so that only the terms  $y_1$  and  $y_3$  contribute to this decay. We may thus make the correspondence of  $y_1$  with  $C$  and  $y_3$  with  $D$  of eqn. (4), modulo factors of  $4\sqrt{m_b}$ . For the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c' \bar{\Lambda}_c$ , after some simplification, we find that in terms of the form factors of eqn. (2),

$$\begin{aligned} A &= -\frac{4\sqrt{m_b}}{3} [3y_4 + y_3 (v_\Lambda \cdot v_\Xi + 1)], \\ B &= -\frac{4\sqrt{m_b}}{3} [3y_2 + y_1 (v_\Lambda \cdot v_\Xi - 1)]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, all 4 form factors contribute to this decay.

At this point one may question whether anything has been gained here. For the general decays, without consideration of HQET, we saw that there was a total of 4 form factors describing the 2 decays we considered. Now, using the spin symmetry of HQET, we find that 4 form factors are still required, but the form factors for the decay into  $\Xi_c' \bar{\Lambda}_c$  are in some way related to those for the decay into  $\Xi_c^* \bar{\Lambda}_c$ .

A similar situation arises when we consider the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^{(*)} \bar{\Sigma}_c^{(*)}$ . Ten form factors are needed to describe these 4 decays. With spin symmetry arguments, we will see that ten form factors are still needed, but new relations among the form factors from different decay modes arise. The decays in question are

described by the amplitude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(B \rightarrow \Xi_c^{('*,*)} \bar{\Sigma}_c^{(*)}) &= \frac{\sqrt{m_b}}{2} \bar{B}_\lambda^{(m)}(v_\Xi) \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \gamma_5 (\not{p} - 1) \\ &\times P^{\lambda\kappa} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) B_\kappa^{(m')}(v_\Sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mu\nu} &= g_{\mu\nu}(A + \not{p}_\Xi B) + \sigma_{\mu\nu}(C + \not{p}_\Xi D) + v_\mu v_\nu(E + \not{p}_\Xi F) \\ &+ v_\mu \gamma_\nu(G + \not{p}_\Xi H) + \gamma_\mu v_\nu(I + \not{p}_\Xi J). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

For the general amplitude, one may write

$$M = \bar{B}_\lambda^{(m)}(v_\Xi) R^{\lambda\kappa} B_\kappa^{(m')}(v_\Sigma) \quad (14)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\mu\nu} &= x_1 g^{\mu\nu} + x_2 \sigma^{\mu\nu} + x_3 v^\mu \gamma^\nu + x_4 \gamma^\mu v^\nu + x_5 v^\mu v^\nu \\ &+ \gamma_5 [x'_1 g^{\mu\nu} + x'_2 \sigma^{\mu\nu} + x'_3 v^\mu \gamma^\nu + x'_4 \gamma^\mu v^\nu + x'_5 v^\mu v^\nu]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In terms of these, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= 2\sqrt{m_B} [A(r_1 - r_2) - B], \quad x'_1 = 2\sqrt{m_B} [A(r_1 + r_2) - B], \\ x_2 &= -2\sqrt{m_B} [C(r_1 + r_2) + D], \quad x'_2 = 2\sqrt{m_B} [C(r_1 - r_2) + D], \\ x_3 &= -2\sqrt{m_B} [H(r_1 + r_2) + G], \quad x'_3 = -2\sqrt{m_B} [C(r_1 - r_2) + G], \\ x_4 &= -2\sqrt{m_B} [J(r_1 + r_2) + I + 2ir_1 C], \\ x'_4 &= 2\sqrt{m_B} [J(r_1 - r_2) + I + 2ir_1 C], \\ x_5 &= -2\sqrt{m_B} [F - 2r_1 H - E(r_1 - r_2)], \\ x'_5 &= 2\sqrt{m_B} [F - 2r_1 H - E(r_1 + r_2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

If we now examine each of the 4 decays separately, we would find that the form factor  $A$  of eqn. (2) that describes the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^* \bar{\Sigma}_c$  is expressible in terms of the 5 form factors  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$  and  $x_5$ , while  $B$  is expressible in terms of the 5 primed form factors. Similarly, for the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^* \bar{\Sigma}_c^*$ ,  $C$  and  $D$  of eqn. (3) are linear superpositions of  $x_1, x_3, x_5$  and  $x'_1, x'_3, x'_5$ , respectively, while for the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^* \bar{\Sigma}_c$ ,  $C$  and  $D$  of eqn. (4) depend on  $x_1, x_4, x_5, x'_1, x'_4$  and  $x'_5$ . Finally, for the decay  $B \rightarrow \Xi_c^* \bar{\Sigma}_c^*$ ,  $E_1, E_2, E_3$  and  $E_4$  of eqn. (5) are expressible in terms of  $x_1, x'_1, x_5$  and  $x'_5$ . In fact, in the manner we have written things,  $E_1 = x_1, E_2 = x_5, E_3 = x'_1$  and  $E_4 = x'_5$ .

One can perform the same kind of analysis when only one of the daughter baryons in the decay is heavy. As one would expect from the above discussion, spin symmetry does not decrease the numbers of form factors required for such decays, and the relationships among form factors are even less encouraging than for the decays into two heavy baryons.

## 4 Conclusion

The preceding discussion has shown us that it is quite simple to enumerate the maximum number of form factors necessary to describe the two-body baryonic decays of the  $B$  meson. It has also shown us that the use of HQET when at least one of the daughter baryons is heavy leads to some relationships among these general form factors. However, these relationships are of limited usefulness without further input, since they do not decrease the number of form factors.

For further input, one may turn, for example, to SU(3) flavor symmetry, which would relate the  $\Sigma_c^{(*)}$  and the  $\Xi_c^{('*,*)}$ , for instance. This has been done in ref. [4]. Other possibilities for further input are explicit model calculations such as the diquark model [5], or the pole model [6]. As an example of the possible usefulness of such models, note that the pole model tells us that none of the baryons (as opposed to antibaryons) can have spin 3/2. This would immediately place restrictions on the form factors of eqns. (3), (4) and (5). Such considerations are left as possible extensions of this work.

## Acknowledgement

WR thanks the Institute for Nuclear Theory, Seattle, WA, where portions of this manuscript were written.

## References

- [1] Particle Data Group, J. J. Hernández *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **239B** (1990) 1.
- [2] N. Isgur and M. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B232** (1989) 113; Phys. Lett. **B237** (1990) 527; B. Grinstein, Nucl. Phys. **B339** (1990) 253; H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. **B240** (1990) 447; A. Falk, H. Georgi, B. Grinstein and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B343** (1990) 1; A. Falk and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. **B247** (1990) 406; T. Mannel, W. Roberts and Z. Rysak, Harvard Preprint HUTP-91/A017, 1991, to appear in Nucl. Phys. B.

- [3] N. Isgur and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B348** (1991) 276; H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. **B348** (1991) 293; T. Mannel, W. Roberts and Z. Ryzak, Nucl. Phys. **B355** (1991) 38.
- [4] M. J. Savage and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B326** (1989) 15; X. Li and D. Wu, Phys. Lett. **218B** (1989) 357.
- [5] P. Ball and H. G. Dosch, Heidelberg Preprint HD-THEP-90-30, 1990.
- [6] M. Jarfi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D43** (1991) 1599; N. G. Deshpande, A. Soni and J. Trampetic, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A3** (1988) 749.